

Employee's reply to Mr. Baer,
Pres. of Reading R.R.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class

335

Book

Em73

Volume

Ja 09-20M

ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT



AN EMPLOYEE'S REPLY

TO MR. BAER, PRESIDENT OF THE READING RAILROAD.

Mr. Baer, president of the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad, delivered an address to the students of the college at Reading, Pa., in which he makes an effort to inculcate a false view of the relationship of the capitalist and the laborers. It might be well to preface this analysis of Mr. Baer's oration by stating that the railroad at which he is at the head, is one of Mr. Morgan's system, and has in the past been the most prolific source of the corruption and bribery of the state politics of Pennsylvania. The state and congressional investigating committees have secured, from time to time, the most damnable evidence of this corruption. It has bought legislators and state officials like so many cattle, by the head, and has robbed the people and is still robbing them, by the most extortionate rates and favoritism on transportation. It has had some of the most notable strikes and has treated its employes as so many revolting slaves.

I shall take some of the most concrete and striking statements of Mr. Baer and make comment directly under them, so that the line of thought may be more easily followed. My quotations are from a newspaper report of what he said. You will note the attempt in the first paragraph to appeal to the religious sentiment and prejudice of the people. Corruptionists always have some very good excuse for any bad position. It is the "Stealing the livery of Heaven to serve the devil in."

"In the beginning man was commanded to labor," said Mr. Baer. "When the law was given amid blackness, and darkness, and terrible thunder, from Sinai, the command was repeated: 'Six days shalt thou labor.' This is the law which Christ came to fulfill and not to destroy, and which St. Paul so arbitrarily enforces by boldly declaring: 'If a man will not work, neither shall he eat.' From this eternal law of labor arise great social problems, which have perplexed, and, until the final consummation of all things, will continue to perplex the world."

In the command to labor, is there no difference as to the character of the labor? Is there no difference what kind of work is produced? If a man work six days at stealing, or robbing or bribing legislators, or oppressing the poor, does that fulfill the command to labor? It is the man who does this bad labor that is enabled to dress in fine linen and purple, while the poor slaves who work at things useful have little to eat and wear. The

master class has been preaching for centuries the virtue of labor, but they have been very diligent in doing no useful labor which they hold up to their slaves as the ideal of life. As president of the Reading Railroad it is Mr. Baer's business to see how much he can get out of his wage-slaves and the public and how little he can give in return. This is his labor and if he succeeds well he is counted a success and great wealth that others produce is showered on him and his co-conspirators.

Again, if we are commanded to work but six days, is it not wrong to labor seven days? And if it is harmful for a man to do this as an individual, what must be the position of the man who compels thousands of others to labor seven days per week—and long hours per day—and himself do no useful labor?

"All men as laborers are not equal.

"The equality of man is spoken of as if it were an axiom. I think the phrase is misleading. It is an illogical inference from the brotherhood of man, which, second only to our relation to God, is the very heart and soul of Christianity."

Who said all men as laborers were equal? Who said that all bribers and railroad lobbyists are equal? But suppose they are not equal, does that give any person or corporation the right to make its own estimate of their worth? Men all have a right to live and having that right they have the right to all the air, all the land, all the water they can use—for without these things they could not live. The right of all men to vote equally is conceded and as citizens are recognized by this as equals in the matters that concern them as citizens. These laborers are as much concerned as citizens as to what share of their products they shall have, and THEY have the RIGHT and the POWER to say whether they are equal or not—not Mr. Baer. He has the right as one citizen to make this assertion. The laborers are foolish to sustain a private ownership system that gives Mr. Baer the power to make their wages and their hours. Brotherhood infers economic equality. If three brothers went fishing, one to fish, another to dig bait and another to tend camp and cook, would it be very brotherly for one of them to say to the others that they were not his equal and that they should not have enough to eat because their work was not equal to his?

"In the true Christian sense, every laborer, if he does not, as Kingsley puts it, 'work in the devil's workshop,' is our brother—to be honored, respected and treated as a brother. If he is poor, sick, afflicted, and physically or mentally unable to support himself, they that are rich and strong must help him. But neither Christianity, morality, nor common sense requires or commands us to support or associate with depraved laborers. In nine cases out of ten, it is the lazy, mischievous, and vain, who eternally rant about an equality, which should make the industrious support the idle, the honest divide with the dishonest, the upright and pure-minded associate with the base, vile, and obscene."

Talk about the rich parasites supporting the poor, sick or

afflicted! If it were not for the extortion of the rich who hold the possession of the wealth others have created, there would be no poor. It is the industrious who support the rich in vicious activity or idleness and extravagance. It is the rich who "divide" the wealth created by the work of all among themselves. It is the rich who adulterate goods, who devise cunning schemes to swindle their brothers, who bribe legislators, judges and the public service. They who prate about pure-mindedness are the base who do it to cover their own vileness. They quote volubly from the Bible to make believe that they are above suspicion. "No rich man shall enter the kingdom of heaven." "They reap where they have not sown and gather where they have not strawed."

"In a political sense, every man is the equal of every other man—that is, he is entitled to the same rights and protection, and to be governed by uniform laws. But even this equality presupposes good citizenship. He who ceases to labor for the common good and transgresses the laws of the land, thereby becomes a common enemy. His liberty is taken from him; he is locked up in a prison cell, and is denied all political equality."

In a political sense, and in a religious sense before God, all men are equal—by what calculus then do the men who hold Mr. Baer's view assume to tell the workers of the world that they are not equal? The men who labor producing the good things of life work for the common good—but men who occupy the places of power appropriate the common good for their private uses. Most of the rich are criminal. They alone bribe the public functions. Poor men never bribe—they have not the wherewith to do it. The king always has convenient laws that enable him to lock up those who refuse to bow the suppliant knee—and he does this under the plea of public good, when in fact the public good would be best served by the king being locked up or at least put to useful work. Capitalists are like kings—they do not labor for the common good but for their private greed—and are therefore common enemies. Not that they are worse than other men, but their interests as capitalists make them prey off the rest of society. This feeling is generally recognized by the common dislike of monopolies.

"It cannot follow, therefore, that in any just conception of the brotherhood or equality of man, society can be reorganized so as to make every man a co-partner, as a laborer, with every other man, and entitles him to share equally, without regard to the work each does or the capital each puts in the business."

Brotherhood demands the economic equality of man. It was the "doctrine and fellowship" of the Christ and disciples. Among them none strove to take advantage of his brother and amass individual wealth, "but they had all things common, so that none had need." Society can be organized on such a basis and will not be Christian until it is so organized. We have that common

ownership in the postal system, the public schools, the public highways and hundreds of things—but we lack that “share and share alike” for service to make such ownership effective and good. No one desires to have every one share equally regardless of work. Socialism demands that each shall share according to the efforts he shall make. The whole people possessing all the capital would not have to pay some member for the use of what all have produced. Payment for capital is like recognizing the divine right of kings. Who made all the capital? Laboring people. Why then should they have to pay for use of what they have created? Of course the capitalists will endeavor to make the people believe it just that they pay for the use of capital, but equity and morals are against it. You know it was the “hard man, the man who reaped where he had not sown,” that wanted interest on capital.

“When you have stripped communistic Socialism of its rhetoric and verbiage, it is based on this false conception of the equality of man.”

“Men are not equal, physically or mentally. Their constitutional differences are wisely designed to enable the collective man to subdue the earth. Division of labor, according to the capacity, is the great secret of the conquering ages. Equality and common occupation is the dead plane of barbarism. The great army of laborers who are subduing the earth, air and seas, is divided like an army of fighters. The masses are in the ranks; there are captains of tens and hundreds, and of thousands. Such as prove their fitness by superior work are promoted from the ranks to be captains. It has truthfully been said that we cannot all be major generals, and there can be but one commander-in-chief. Some of you will remember how, during the civil war, we enjoyed the droll proposal of Artemus Ward to recruit a regiment in which all should be major generals. Was it, after all, more absurd than the twaddle Professor Ely refers to, of the traditional elderly gentleman who tells all the boys in the village school that they may one day become president of the United States? The chances are one to seventy millions. The lottery offers better chances; but we wisely pass laws to suppress the lottery.”

When you have stripped capitalism of its verbiage, it is based on the assumption of the divine right of one man to rule another—of the divine right of kings. It treats men as though they were hogs—some fat, some lean, some big, some little, some white, some black. Treated as cattle, the working people subdue the earth—they clear forests, open and operate mines, build houses, factories and railroads—and the capitalist who does none of these things own them! That is the kind of equality that pleases Mr. Baer. The capitalists tell labor to build and be satisfied with the shanties, while the directors will occupy the palaces.

The simile used about the ranks and captains and generals and commander in chief is the simile that leads to the divine right of kings again. Mr. Baer seems to like that conclusion, but does not openly say so. Again, he says the laws that prevent lotteries should apply to the boys attaining the presidency!

That is pretty rank. But then it is really in effect. But would he make laws to prevent gambling in stocks, bonds and the food of the people? If such gambling had been prohibited by law, how could the great fortunes have been built up? Everyone of them has been produced by gambling in some sort—of taking chances.

¶The fact that stands out clear to any mind, even to the dullest laborer if he will but stop and think, is that each man in his place is just as essential to the world's work as any other man in his place. The Reading railroad could run if it had no president—but it could not run if it had no section hands. If the section hands do more of such work than the president could if he could hire no one to do it, then they are as much entitled to an equal share in the results of the co-operated labor as Mr. Baer. They do more of their kind of work than Mr. Baer could and he does more of his kind of work (assuming he does something useful) than they could, so each has his skill and puts in his time. If there were no parties hogging the product, the section men and others above them would have income enough to live in good houses, educate their families, dress them well and fit them for the best society. It is their enforced poverty, produced by the recognition of the private ownership of the railroad, that make their families unfit to be anything but servants. Some of the richest families have sprung from the most debased and clownish ancestors. In fact, all of us have come from a common parentage, if we go back far enough. As soon as the majority, who are workers and poor, realize the cheat that is being practiced on them, they will change the laws and begin to enjoy the results of their own labor. A majority have the right to make any laws they like in this country, and the man who denies it writes himself a public enemy to the nation and the people. Mr. Baer will likely say that the courts stand in the way of the majority making laws that will give them their own—but he will discover that courts are a creation of the majority and can be made and unmade at the pleasure of the majority.

“The incentive to labor is the reward it brings. If you take away the reward, you destroy the motive. He is a vain, foolish fellow who believes it possible to have all civilized men work for a common reward, when each will receive no more than just what he absolutely needs from the common stock. Why, this was the primitive state of man, from which it has taken thousands of years to extricate him. It is practically the tribal law of the Indians. All hope of civilizing them will fail until they are taught the great law of private property, and given a motive for exertion. We labor for ourselves and our families. Which of you would work as you now work, if, at the setting sun the result of your labor was to be turned over to the profligate, the idle and the beastly? African slavery would be more tolerable. Man is not a brute nor a machine. The Greeks significantly named him a looker-on. Woe unto him when he ceases to look up! when ambition and hope die, as die they will, when the incentive to work is taken from him!”

I do not think one has much incentive to labor when he gets

only two or three dollars a day. When the reward of labor is taken away from him but that, he becomes hopeless. And most of them do become hopeless and sink down into the great ocean of mediocre. It is a false assumption about Socialism giving to each from the common store just enough for absolute needs. It is absurd. Who would get the balance? Men can produce more in four hours, all doing useful work, than they can consume. If they do their share, then each will have all their material wants supplied and opportunities for supplying all their mental wants. What more COULD they have or want? As it is today working people are lower, in instances, than the Indians. They sink into savagery and hundreds of thousands of policemen and officials are hired to beat them into brutal submission.

If men only worked for themselves and their families, what a beautiful world this would be. But the men on the Reading road and its mines and shops are working for the families of the Morgans, Vanderbilts, Baers and hundreds of others, who live frivolous lives off the labor of their slaves. The rich are the profligate and the idle and the beastly. This system makes men brutes and machines. Chattel slavery brutalized the master class as it did the black man. Wage-slavery brutalizes the master class as it does the wage-slaves. Capitalists do not hesitate to hire ignorant men to shoot down their slaves if they protest against their treatment. It is the growing ambition to rise in an increasing number of the workers today that inspires Mr. Baer to speak and if possible throw dust in their eyes that they will not want the very thing that will make them free—the common ownership of the capital of the nation.

"These are simple truths, but they are constantly ignored by the loud-mouthed, lazy teachers of communism, and the fomenters of strife and discord. How much good might be done if all men could honestly be made to see that property is the reward of labor! What an immense amount of charity it takes to look without envy upon the property of our neighbors! How apt we are to ignore his superior gifts and his greater thrift!"

It is the fact that property SHOULD be the reward of labor: that is causing all the strife. As it is now, property is the reward of cunning, of adulteration, of bribery, of thievery in various legal forms. The rich have no charity, for they do not look at the property of their neighbors without envy—they envy the workers the property they produce and proceed to adopt any method possible, from purchased laws to open murder, to get it. It is rather amusing to talk about the greater thrift of the rich—those who have done nothing but spend in extravagance the millions wrung from the workers in various forms of interest, rent and profit! If only the workers would always be contented to give up their labor

to their skimmers and make no outcry! What a lovely world it would be—for the skimmers.

"That which we call capital (I speak now not of the great riches of the few, dishonestly won, but of the legitimate accumulations of the frugal and industrious), is, after all, no more than the storage of past labor, it may be of the present possessor or of his ancestors—labor which was saved and stored for future use through self-denial."

You see he acknowledges that great riches are ill-gotten. Then why are these fortunes not returned to those to whom they belong? All capital is stored or unused labor, and has been created by the human family as a whole, and therefore belongs to it as a whole. All men have the right to use their heritage from the race, and none have a right to appropriate the exclusive from the race, and none have a right to appropriate the exclusive use of it. See how the fortunes of the Astors, the Vanderbilts, the Morgans, the Hills and the kings and princes have been stored through self-denial! Working people, you should quit buying prizes for your daughters! You should quit building yachts, and special cars and giving great banquets—and your self-denial will make you rich!

"The earnings of labor in excess of present subsistence, becomes capital, to be invested in houses, lands, and all forms of property. If a man earns \$10 a week and spends but \$6 to support himself, he has a surplus of \$4, which represents so much labor stored for future use."

And suppose you have a system that provides that every man may have a house, or all the land he can use, or all the tools he needs in his vocation—what then becomes of your investment? This system keeps many poor so the owners can profit. If there were no homeless there would be no tenants. If there were public capital there would be no payment to drones or dividends. There would be no need of saving and skimping and making a struggle all the time to get into a position to be secure in a place to employ your talent. Life is not for gathering property—certainly God did not put men on a planet that can supply all their wants just to see them fight and strive against each other to see who could get the most. Nature has enough obstacles to overcome without making any artificial ones.

"To illustrate: Two men of equal strength and capacity for earning start life together. The one spends the whole of his weekly earnings to gratify present desires. He denies himself nothing which he can buy. The other sees and longs for many things which could give him momentary pleasure, but looking to the future, he makes a temporary sacrifice, and does without them. In this way, each week he saves a little. Little by little he accumulates. In the course of years he is the owner of property. As he grows older, he works less, and makes his stored labor, now called capital, work for him. The one who spent as he earned, finds himself old and poor, and compelled to labor for his daily bread, as he did in the vigor of youth. He sees his former fellow workman well-to-do, and taking life easily. Instead of seeking the true cause of disparity, in the bitterness of his soul he believes himself injured and unfortunate. Then comes the superficial reformer, to whom a little

learning has been a dangerous thing, and tells him that this cruel inequality is caused by a defective organization of society. The truth, that the fault was not in government, nor in the stars, but in himself, seems never to occur to him."

Let us illustrate it this way. Here is a child born of parents who are poor and cannot give it the opportunity to develop any genius it has. Here is another child that inherits millions. Why should one child have to work for the other because of some action of the parents, done before it came into the earth? It is all a lie about one SAVING a fortune by labor, let him deny himself ever so much. Imagine a workingman raising a family on \$2 a day and saving money to make a fortune! Why should a man have to save capital when there has been and always will be a continually increasing accumulation of capital sufficient to employ all the people? And if a child inherits a fortune, it can live on the labor of others without any labor itself—without doing anything to entitle it to live. Does it have to save? Does it have to earn anything for a start, in which Mr. Bauer puts so much virtue? Many a poor child, if it had opportunity, would make a better king or ruler than the sot who sets on the throne—but is there any opportunity for it to get to the throne? How few the vocations today that are open to the children now being born of working parents. The lands have all been gobbled by corporations and speculators, the mines have all been made private property, the highways are in hands of transportation kings, the money and exchange is completely monopolized by the great commercial barons—is it any wonder the thinking, working people are demanding a change in a system that has robbed them of their natural rights before they were born? It would be their fault indeed if they did not protest. "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing" for kings and tyrants. They want the people to have no knowledge at all, except the stupid plodding of the human machine. In this country the working people are not only wanted as industrial machines for the production of wealth for the Trusts and Monopolies, but they are expected to become the VOTING MACHINES also. If the slaves were to revolt and vote for those who want a change of system, that would upset the whole capitalistic, gambling, slave-producing game. There is no more sense or reason in a child having to come up and work for years to produce pay for the capital it uses than for the child to be denied a desk in the public school until it has saved enough to pay its share of the building, and the expenses of the public school system. Or that it should not mail a letter until it not only paid for the cost of the missive, but also the interest on the capital of the postal system ever since it was started. Such a position is too absurd for contemplation.

"The owner of property has a right to control its lawful use.

Ownership is a mere sham and delusion if it does not carry with it this control. So long as a man does not violate the laws of the community, or of God, he must be left free to use his property as he sees fit. There is no distinction here between capital and labor. Every man must mind his own business. You know it is said to be the way to get rich. But it is very hard to do; we are continually meddling with our neighbor's affairs."

What is the lawful use of property? Is it not what the law stipulates? Then the laws, being made by man, man has a right to change those laws. If men have a right to limit the interest rate, they have the right to regulate the uses of all other property. Ownership of property is only another name for the ownership of men. Men cannot be free if another owns the things which he must use to live. He can live only on the terms and conditions imposed by that other. It is because the few are continually meddling with other people's business, in adulterating their food, raising the price of coal and other things, or lowering the rate of wages or increasing the hours of labor, that is the trouble. The food of a nation is public, not private business, for it affects all the people. This applies to every industry. The master wanted to use his slaves as he saw fit, and he made laws that enabled him to do so. Capitalists control the law making machinery, have employed the most cunning lawyers, and the laws are just about what they want them. Property passes down the line of family relation because the king's title passed down in the same way. Property in men was upheld as divine by the very class of men who now hold that private property is sacred, and laws should be made solely for its protection. Men have a right to do with their property as they see fit—but we must first inquire what is THEIR property? The property that has been produced by the millions of dead and living people is NOT the property of the capitalists who have cunningly possessed themselves of it—no more than the property which the thief has stolen belongs to him to do with as he sees fit.

"In all ages of the world false teachers make themselves and their fellow-men miserable discontented and most unhappy, by regarding the prosperity of one as the injury of another. It is shockingly true that "for every right work a man is envied of his neighbors."

In all ages and in all countries false teachers have been sent among the people, appealing to their ignorance and prejudices, to make them satisfied with slavery to the master class. They have taught them to worship idols, that they might profit by the making of idols. The wise men, the good men, who went among the people, teaching them better, have always been denounced as false teachers and killed and crucified. No man is envied for right work, for right work helps every one—it is wrong work that begets discontent.

"The most society can do is to give every man an equal chance of developing and using his powers, and to secure him in his re-

ward according to his work. The equal chance I mean is fairly stated by Charles Kingsley, in answer to a criticism on 'Alton Locke:' "True Socialism, true liberty, brotherhood and true equality (not the carnal, dead-level equality of the communist, but the spiritual equality of the church idea, which gives every man an equal chance of developing and using God's gifts, and rewards every man according to his work, without respect of persons), is only to be found in loyalty, and obedience to 'Christ's teachings.' "

Society can, and society yet will give every man and woman an opportunity to develop the genius they have. It does not do this when it permits corporations and individuals to own and control "and do with as they see fit," the land, machinery and exchange of the nation. The son of the man who owns the plant can work there if he choose, but the son of a poor man cannot work there except by the permission of the owner. The poor son may have the most ability, may have the most willingness, but that does not give him a chance. There are many sons and only a few places at the top. So far as the PUBLIC is concerned, there are many men in the employ of the Reading Railroad who would make better presidents than Mr. Baer, but Mr. Morgan picks out Mr. Baer because he thinks he can make more money out of the public and the employes than any other man—he cares nothing for the society except what he can make out of it. The name of Christ in the mouth of monopolists ought to choke them. Christ denounced the rich, and the monopolist, and the usurer—but the rich understand how to trade in religion as they would in stocks and bonds. In this they are only repeating the ways that the priests of the heathen temples used to keep the people loyal to the king, and to put down as an offense against God every aspiration of the people for a part of life. But there is one thing certain—Mr. Baer cannot meet the Socialist on the platform before the people, nor can he answer the accusations and logic of their works. The hope that he and his class has is that they can prejudice the people against Socialism so they will not read it. Then they can control them in the future, as in the past.

"I think it may be conceded that society is not so perfectly organized as to secure every man an equal chance. The natural law of the survival of the fittest, which apparently controls the animal kingdom, shocks our sense of justice; but it has so far limited the efforts of the wisest legislators to create a perfect society, wherein the weak shall have an equal chance with the strong, and the foolish with the wise. The society of the future can perhaps increase the power of restraint, which it has in modern times wisely exercised in abrogating laws of primogeniture, laws in restraint of alienation, exempting lands from sale for payments of debts, and in exacting reasonable laws regulating the descent of real and personal property."

While conceding that society is not perfect, Mr. Baer nor the legislators have or propose any laws upon lines different from those which society grows restless under. He admits that society does not give every man an equal chance. Socialism

will provide a system in which every man will have an equal chance. The capital will be public, every man will have the same right to employment as every other man; he will get nothing if he does not employ himself, and will get as much as any other if he will take his natural place in the ranks of production. No man or small set of men will have the power to shut him out of employment, or say how many hours or what pay he shall have. There is less need of restraint than to open opportunity. If the public will transport my goods at cost, or will sell me oil at cost, it will require no laws in restraint to prevent the railroads in private hands from extorting, or the oil company from overcharging. I will have the opportunity to get service at the least possible cost, and that is all I am entitled to. It is this "equal opportunity" that the capitalists object to. They want no public capital, as that would prevent, without any other law, their extorting from the public. Just as laws prevent the entailing of property, so laws making enough property public to employ all the people would make unnecessary any laws restraining the transfer of any kind of property. If people could work for themselves (the public) and get all they produced, they would not work for anybody else for less than the whole of what they produced, and that would soon settle the hiring of men by their brothers for profit. For profit off another is as surely a specie of slavery, as was the profit of the master from chattel slaves.

"Whatever changes the future may bring forth, the great law that every laborer shall be protected in his inalienable right to labor must in all times be a well proportioned pillar of free government."

What the laborer wants more than even the right to labor is the full results of his labor. Any employer will permit men to labor—it is the paying them of the EQUIVALENT of what their labor produces that is the trouble. I have a few acres of ground here. I will let all the people labor on it that desire. They may dig post holes and fill them up again. Nothing would result. So you see, it is not labor, but the results of WELL-DIRECTED labor that is not open to the worker. Nobody denies the right to labor—they deny the opportunity to labor productively and get the full results of their labor. For instance, the Reading Railroad taxes the public many millions annually on coal and transportation. It will not allow those who mine the coal, haul it to market and keep up the railroad, to share in the receipts. The managers "divide up" the earnings of the people among themselves. If the slaves complain, they are discharged or blacklisted. They want only those who know only enough to work—but not think.

"Religious liberty! Freedom to worship God! This, surely, we will not surrender. It was bought at a great sacrifice. Is liberty

to work less desirable than liberty to worship? Can the one live without the other? Are we free men in the sense of the Declaration of Independence, whose liberties are vouchsafed by the constitution, if their be any power in this broad land to control our choice of labor? Shall we be denied the right to work in the lawful vocations of man because we do not belong to a particular labor organization?"

What good is religious liberty if man is hungry? Man has always been free to worship God—only his conceptions have not always been alike, and therefore, could not be right. There has never been a moment when man could not worship his conception of God in his innermost soul, and no one could read or prevent that. Cunning always raises a false issue. They are continually ringing cow bells in the corn field of labor while they rob his melon patch. Industrial liberty is what the world of thinkers demand. Are men free, when the railroads they work on are owned and operated by CORPORATIONS (unions of the men who work not)? Are men free when they are denied the right of employment by a general manager? Would the public owning and the railroad men operating and making all the rules and regulations make the men slaves? Slavery of men to their unions! It is FREEDOM when men make their own rules. It is slavery when their rules are made by others without their consent. And that is what is done today. Under Socialism the men employed in the railroad department would make all the rules and regulations regarding their employment. It would be a rule by the majority of men who were all conversant with the business on which they voted. Every railroad in this country could and would run if there were no presidents managing to skin the workers. How absurd that the ten thousand employes and as many more indirectly dependent on the Reading Railroad should have to obey the rules or laws of a small board of directors! No wonder the president desires to prejudice the men against labor unions of their own! He wants control of the men for the benefit of his company—not for the benefit of the majority or society. Are men logically slaves of the officers they elect to public service? Or are they slaves when they are controlled by masters not of their selection? If it were not for labor unions the rate of wages paid by the Reading Company would not be half what it is today.

"Let it be said once for all, that it is, as it ought to be, lawful for laborers to organize, to use all lawful means to obtain higher wages and better conditions, and to quit work singly or in a body. This is their liberty. But has not every man a similar liberty of action? If he chooses to work at any vocation, and on any terms, is not this his liberty? And what moral or legal right has a labor organization to deprive him of his inalienable liberty to work? Yet, it is being done every day. Men are driven from work, threatened, abused, called all manner of harsh names, their wives and children are insulted, and a social ostracism is established, which compels good, honest workmen to bear the pangs of hunger rather than endure the threats and gibes of their fellow workmen. In some trades,

employers are not permitted to employ workmen without labor organization cards. Union men will not work with non-union men. Was ever greater tyranny practiced by one set of men over their fellow men? Surely, if the Roman Catholics were to refuse to work with Protestants, or Protestants with Roman Catholics, there would be a howl of indignation reaching every corner of the land. Is there any difference in principle between the two?"

When men are traitors to their class, when they will enlist like Hessians to serve masters for a pittance, they become enemies of their class and deserve ostracism. They would cause a fall in wages that would cause more misery and degradation in the world than the misery caused them and theirs by the ostracism of their fellow workmen. Workmen who are intelligent, stick together like the capitalists. The capitalists only control by dividing the workmen and conquering them in detail, which they could not do if the men acted as a unit. And against whom are workers thus "lawfully organized to obtain better conditions and wages? Who are the people who oppress them? Who does not pay them enough? Who makes them work under bad conditions? Is it not the Reading Railroad managers, of which Mr. Baer is president? This oppressor of labor, this extorter on freight and passenger traffic, this corruptionist of the legislature, this Reading Railroad—think of it giving the employees right advice! Rich, isn't it?

"Government by injunction, as the catch phrase goes—they tell us must cease. 'Blind leaders of the blind.' 'They know not what they do.' The very essence of law is government by injunction. 'Thou shalt not,' of the Ten Commandments, is God's eternal injunction; and earthly power, in imitation of the heavenly, asserts its most beneficent authority when the legally constituted courts in mercy to the wrongdoer, stays his lawless hand by the law's decree, 'Thou shalt not!' I rejoice in the steadfastness of the judges, who in every hour of this nation's life have been the steadfast defenders of liberty regulated by law; and have turned deaf ears to the cry of the mob, and the temporary insanity of the multitude, and have administered justice and equity between man and man, without a shadow of favor, fear or trembling, on the broad principles of constitutional law established by our fathers."

Government by injunction is not liked by the masses, any more than government by the force of armed soldiery. But the railroad presidents like it. The injunction is always on their side. They understand the use of putting passes and other favors where they will do the most good. Judges ride on passes and then try cases with the very bribes in their pockets! "Thou shalt not" does not apply to railroad extortion and corruption. The history of their existence shows that all along. Well may the railroads rejoice in the steadfastness of the judges to do their bidding. It is meet that Mr. Baer should call the multitude insane! The few that want to rule and rob the many must have some excuse for their action. The majority—the multitude—are insane! Therefore, the railroads have the right to rule them by injunction! And give judges such favors that they will always serve the railroads instead of the public good. When

the majority wake up some day they will elect judges who love justice more than money, who hate injustice, and then will come a reckoning that will startle the earth—of rich people. That day is nearing, and the rich feel it, and they are losing no time in spending money like water in organizing a military system by which they hope a minority well armed and directed will be able to control the majority unarmed and divided. The union men at Latimer, at Hazelton, at Coal Creek, at Coeur d'Alene, at Buffalo—and hundreds of places have felt what that means—and yet they foolishly hold to the same parties and vote the same tickets as their masters who have done these things to them and have been upheld in such murders of the workers by the men they have elected. But the mills of the gods grind slowly, etc.

"Work will not be worship in this country until it is universally conceded that no man shall be deprived of his right to work, by law, by force, by threats, by social ostracism, by boycott, or by insult; no man shall be denied the right to select his own vocation; no man shall be denied the right to work as many hours as he pleases, and at any price he pleases, and no man shall be boycotted or injured in his business because he employs non-union labor."

Work will not be worship in this country until every man shall have the same ownership and interest in his work and the production, and shall have the full results of such labor. There will then be no incentive to deprive him of labor, no incentive to ostracise him or blacklist him. He will then have the right to select his vocation—today he cannot; he will then need work no more than four hours for all the good things of life—now he does not get them, no matter how much he works; then he will have only the rules he votes for himself—not such as are made by masters. There will be no masters, no slaves. The whole people will be the employers and the whole people will be the employed, and the whole people will have the results of the employment as each has done his service. Then work will be worship. It is never worship when done for a master, under a master and for a master's profit.

"Labor may organize, but it may not tyrannize. Labor organizations hitherto have failed because they have entirely overlooked these simple fundamental truths. Instead of using their utmost endeavors to bring the employe and employer closer together, to know and understand each other better, to sympathize with one another, and to heartily co-operate in every reasonable effort to advance the work in which they are engaged, they have tried to make an impassable gulf between the two. The efforts of employers to improve the moral and physical condition of their employes by giving them better houses, with pleasant, sanitary surroundings; by maintaining kindergartens, schools and hospitals; places of amusement, and churches, are looked upon with disfavor, and regarded as a device to seduce workmen from their allegiance to organized labor. The modern theory of labor organizations seems to be that the employer and employe are to be divided into two great hostile camps, armed and fully equipped, at a given signal, to engage in industrial war. Peace is only to be a temporary thing, brought about by formulating a truce between the two contending armies, which shall terminate at the end of the year. In the meantime, the leaders of the hostile camps are to be fully occupied during the whole of the

year in adjusting the thousand and one vexatious misunderstandings as to the true meaning of the terms of the truce. The business is to be carried on by divided authority, each hostile camp having representatives to determine when and how the work shall be done. This is violating the old rule that 'No man can serve two masters.' "

Labor may organize, but it may not tyrannize! Think of one man saying that to millions of workers! Labor organizations have succeeded only in proportion as they have demanded and had power to compel obedience to their demand. They have failed in the object as a whole because they have VOTED (politically) for the masters, while fighting (industrially) the masters for justice. The man who tells labor that the interest of the employer and the employees are identical and mutual is either a knave or a fool. They are antagonists, and always will be. I have been an employer of labor. It was to my interest (as an employer) to get out of those who worked for me the most service for the least pay. If this is not true, then the reverse of it must be true, and that it is to the employer's interest to get the least work for the most pay, which as a business proposition, is too absurd to entertain. On the other hand, it is to the interest of those who work for others to get the most pay for the least service (hours). These statements are so plain that no one need err therein. The interests of labor and capitalist are antagonistic. You cannot make mutual the position of two forces that pull against each other. It is to the interest of the employed to get the most for their services—it is to the interest of the employer to give the least. How can such conditions be twisted to be sympathetic? But when the whole people own all the property, and the whole people are both the employed and employer, then you have mutual interests—then will capitalist and labor be harmonious, for they will be the same people. The employer never gives better houses. All the employer has, the working people gave to HIM. If no one had worked for him he would have nothing to give. He gives out a part of what he takes from labor. Labor builds and forms everything from a pin to a palace. Capital builds nothing, forms nothing. It is only an excuse for the drawing of a part of what labor produces. It is only by centuries of education in the belief of the lie that capital is entitled to profit, that it has its hold on the mind of the people today—that an Astor who has produced nothing can draw three millions annually from rents of houses in New York that working people have builded!

Men cannot serve two masters—they cannot serve man and serve money. Business cannot be carried on by divided authority—therefore, it should be carried on by all the people in their majority voice of authority, not by and for the interests of a small number of alleged owners.

"If it continues," concludes Mr. Baer, "the present industrial supremacy of the United States will soon be a thing of the past, and we will share the fate of England. It is beyond question true

that the primary factor in the decadence of England's industries has been the arbitrary exactions of trades unions.—The London papers continue to call attention to the crisis in British industry, and practically agree that British workmen, through their trades unions, are ruining not only themselves, but the industry of the country."

That which threatens this country is the combination of capitalists and the lies they teach the people to keep their hold on their ill-gotten gains. It is nothing to this country whether we ship goods away, that we have people here who want and cannot buy, because the wages paid are not sufficient to enable them to live fully up to their ideals. Labor unions hold up wages and enable more families to live better than if there were no unions. The London papers that are howling against labor tyranny are the ones that uphold a monarchy! And it is such papers that receive the approval of American (?) capitalists like Baer. Unless the working people of the United States knit a closer industrial and POLITICAL union of their forces, they will have their labor unions destroyed, as they are now in fact, by reason of the judge-made laws in the interest of the masters. What would become of the puny master classes if the working people should UNITE AT THE BALLOT BOX and elect men to office who believe in the whole people owning and operating the industries, instead of a few owning and mastering the workers?

Statistics furnished by the United States government, under republican management, show that under an equitable system of industry each worker, man or woman, could receive more than \$10 a day (present purchasing price of money) for eight hours, and have employment every day he or she desired it. Such a system would produce not a single millionaire, nor could there be any poverty unless it were voluntary poverty. I refer to the Thirtieth Annual Labor Report of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Labor Commissioner, Washington, D. C. You can get one of these reports free by writing for it.

A FINAL WORD.

The working people of this country opened the mines, built and operate the railroads; those doing this were fed and clothed and housed by other working people in other fields of labor—then how comes it that capitalists have possession of what the working people, applying their labor to God's bounty freely given, have produced? They have not been paid for their work, except by the products of themselves. The working people no more need capitalists in railroads and mines and factories, than they need them to furnish public schools, public roads, public postoffices. Mr. Baer talks to deceive the working classes and induce them to continue playing the game at which he and his class are adepts and which they, in all countries and in all ages, have been the easy victims. Working people, why not investigate? The truth will make you free. You are the slaves of capitalists mentally. You have all power in your votes to control your conditions of labor. They control your votes by controlling party machinery. Be men. Right injures no man. Capitalists have no right to profit off your labor any more than the master had the right to profit off his black slaves. Are you not men? Have you no rights except what capitalists give you? Fellow employes, read something beside the capitalist papers; vote something besides their tickets; cease to be slaves.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 059105616